

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JOE AND LAURA SPRINKLE,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	Case No. CV-05-1898-JPD
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
SB&C LTD, a/k/a Skagit Bonded Collectors,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
_____)	

This matter comes before the Court upon plaintiffs' "motion on discovery."¹ Dkt. No. 18. The motion appears to request an extension of time to conduct additional depositions and to compel responses to certain interrogatories. Defendants oppose the motion and requests that sanctions be imposed on plaintiffs' counsel. Dkt. No. 19. Having carefully reviewed the parties' papers, supporting materials, and the balance of the record, the Court ORDERS as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's motion on discovery (Dkt. No. 18) is DENIED. In its January 24, 2006, scheduling order, the Court explained that the pretrial schedule would be amended "only upon good cause shown: failure to complete discovery within the time allowed is not

¹ The motion was filed prior to the close of discovery and before the motions deadline. Dkt. No. 13.

01 recognized as good cause.” Dkt. No. 13. Plaintiffs’ motion provides no showing of good
02 cause. To the contrary, the motion seems to indicate that plaintiffs did not think to seek the
03 now-sought-after discovery during the proper discovery period. Additionally, it appears that
04 plaintiffs have failed to comply with the meet-and-confer provision of Federal Rule of Civil
05 Procedure 37 and Local Rule CR 37. The motion is therefore denied.

06 The Court notes that defendant’s have filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt.
07 No. 21. Plaintiffs are advised to consult the local rules in order timely file an opposition
08 and/or their own motion for summary judgment.

09 (2) Defendant’s request for sanctions (Dkt. No. 19) is DENIED.

10 (3) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this order to the parties.

11 DATED this 7th day of August, 2006.

12
13 s/ James P. Donohue
United States Magistrate Judge